

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/595,227	06/16/2000	MINGMING FANG	99154X204201	2766
	7590 09/06/2002			
PHYLLIS T. TURNER-BRIM, ESQ., LAW DEPARTMENT			EXAMINER	
870 NORTH	OELECTRONICS CORPORATION OMMONS DRIVE		SHAKERI, HADI	
AURORA, IL	60504		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3723	#1U
			DATE MAILED: 09/06/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<i>3</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/595,227	FANG ET AL.				
•	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Hadi Shakeri	3723				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 19 August 2002 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appliced a timely filed amendment whit all (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	ply to a cation in			
	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moleaned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S I36(a) and the appropriate fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	d amendment			
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request fo application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NC)T place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	•					
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-23</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	proved by the Exam	iiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:						



The arguments regarding the rejections under 35USC 103(a) over Huynh et al. in view of Jamens et al. have been considered but they are not persuasive. As indicated in the Final Rejection, paragraph No. 6, the arguments regarding "motivation to combine", "references not teaching or suggesting all the claim limitations" and "reasonable expectation of success or routine optimization " were discussed. It is noted that James et al. teaches the use of the polishing system for polishing both a memory disk or a semiconductor and that polishing a semiconductor is not patenably distinct from polishing a memory disk.

Joseph J. Hail, III
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 3700

Charles J. Hails